

## IMPLEMENTATION



## 5. IMPLEMENTATION

The Trails and Natural Resources Study identifies potential trail routes for consideration. The potential routes are based on existing trails, desired connections, and other corridor opportunities such as creeks. This study is the foundation for continuing work on the development of an adopted trails master plan. Additional work needed for a trails master plan includes discussions with private land owners, further confirmation of potential trails, and completion of CEQA compliance documents. In the mean time, individual trail opportunities will arise and should be pursued. Implementation of individual trail segments can occur with further study.

Implementation of trails on private land can be a complicated process. The Santa Clara County Countywide Trails Master Plan addressed the issue of trails on private lands through an extensive planning process that included private land interests. Further planning for Morgan Hill trails should benefit from the County experience. The Countywide Trails Master Plan used the following key points in creating their plan:

- an extensive public planning process
- work with willing landowners to identify realistic trail opportunities
- a thorough process to identify trail need
- policies and criteria for including proposed trails on private land
- policies and guidelines for trail development.

## 5.1 PROJECTED COSTS

The projected costs for implementing trail projects will vary greatly depending on the program for each project. Costs for the trail itself will vary depending on width, materials, and other factors. Other costs for staging areas, drainage features, amenities such as benches and signs, fencing, landscaping and other features will vary from project to project. In addition to construction costs, total project cost will also include design and construction management. For budgeting, project costs can be distributed as follows: 25% design and project management, 50% construction costs, and 25% construction management. Projects in the planning phase should carry a significant design contingency (30% during planning stage) and a 10% construction contingency.

Sample costs for trail projects:

Unpaved trails – 3'-5' wide, native soil or bark  
\$9-\$15/lf

Improved trails – 6'-8' wide, compacted granular surface  
\$72-\$96/lf

Paved trails – 10'-12' wide, asphalt  
\$180-\$216/lf

Maintenance Costs:

Once the trails are built, they need constant maintenance by public agencies. These maintenance costs should be addressed, considered, and budgeted for during the planning and design phases. Infrastructure bond measures, the State Fund, and incorporating the trails into paving management plans are three possibilities for identifying sources of maintenance funds.

## 5.2 PRIORITIES

Priority trail projects will largely be determined by opportunities that arise through development proposals. Otherwise, priorities for trail projects should include the following factors:

- major corridor trails
- trails that improve safety including improved access to schools and parks, and remove conflicts between cars and pedestrians.
- trails that fill gaps in the trail system
- trails that provide connections to other community facilities, transportation connections, and downtown.



### 5.3 POTENTIAL FUNDING SOURCES

Funding for trail projects will come from a variety of sources. Priority trail projects should be placed on the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Some trails may be funded by developers as part of planned developments, or through development fees paid to the City. Other potential sources of funding include:

- Municipal programs including local bond measures, developer fees, and general fund
- State funding through programs for recreational trails, parks, transportation projects, hazard elimination, and congestion management/air quality
- Federal funding programs including transportation enhancements
- Foundation grant programs
- Safe Routes to Schools



## BIBLIOGRAPHY & ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS



## Bibliography

Bellinger Foster Steinmetz Landscape Architecture. *Bikeways Master Plan: City of Morgan Hill*. January 2001.

City of Morgan Hill Chamber of Commerce Website, <http://www.morganhill.org>

City of Morgan Hill, *The General Plan of Morgan Hill*, August 2005 (General Plan Map Updated July 2006).

City of Morgan Hill Website, <http://www.morgan-hill.ca.gov/>

County of Santa Clara. *Santa Clara Countywide Trails Master Plan: A Landowner's Guide to Trail Easement Dedications*.

Santa Clara County Interjurisdictional Trails Committee. *Uniform Interjurisdictional Trail Design, Use, and Management Guidelines*. April 15, 1999.

Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department & 2M Associates Landscape Architecture and Planning. *Anatomy of the Update Process*. March 1996.

Santa Clara County Parks Website, <http://www.sccgov.org/portal/site/parks>

*Santa Clara County Trails Master Plan Update: Final Countywide Trails Master Plan*. November 1995.

Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority, *Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan: Bicycle Element of VTP 2020*. October 2000.

Santa Clara Valley Water District. *User Manual: Guidelines & Standards for Land Use Near Streams*. Section: Guidance for Trail Design.

Santa Clara Valley Water District Website. <http://www.valleywater.org>

Santa Clara Valley Water Resources Protection Collaborative. *Guidelines & Standards for Land Use Near Streams: A Manual of Tools, Standards and Procedures to Protect Streams and Streamside Resources in Santa Clara County*. Revised July 2006.

Statewide Trails Program and Planning Website, [http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page\\_id=1324](http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=1324)

Valley Transportation Authority Website, <http://www.vta.org>

## Acknowledgements

The writers would like to thank the **Steering Committee Members**, who sacrificed a handful of their Thursday evenings to help make this study a success for their city.

We are especially indebted to **David Gittleson**, the City of Morgan Hill's Project Manager for his effort.

The following people proved invaluable to this study:

**Mark Frederick**, for his wisdom and knowledge of trails planning in Santa Clara County, and his generosity in helping with this study.

**Alan Clark**, for his passion and dedication to making Morgan Hill a better city for cyclists and pedestrians.

**Jim Rowe**, for his insight into the workings of the City of Morgan Hill and his careful critique of the many drafts of this study.